

REMARKS

The Applicant has filed the present Response in reply to the outstanding Official Action of June 22, 2005, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Official Action for the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

At the onset, the Applicant would like to note that Claims 8, 16, 21, 24, 27 and 30 have been amended to clarify the claims. The amendments were made to correct a translation error. The claims have been amended to recite that the image is displayed when a call is incoming from a calling party. Additionally, Claims 24 and 30 have been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled Claims 5 and 22 and Claims 13 and 28, respectively. No new matter has been added by the aforementioned amendments. For example, support therefor can be found at page 2, lines 1-3.

Additionally, the Applicant would like to note that Claims 5, 13, 22-23, 28-29 have been cancelled herewith without prejudice to their reintroduction into this or any other related application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadowaki et al., United States Patent No. 5,414,457) (hereinafter “Kadowaki”) in view of Schwartz, United States Patent No. 5,872,923.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s rejection and traverses with at least the following analysis.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest inserting a telephone number or other personal information in a comment segment of a JPEG file as recited in the pending independent claims.

The Examiner avers that Schwartz teaches that a record comprises multiple fields, which have a captured image and a telephone directory and that one skilled in the art would recognize that this teaching of a captured image and the telephone number being stored is in the same file so that the telephone number is recorded in a comment segment of a JPEG file, thereby allowing direct capture of video stream in the database.

The Examiner's assertion is technically flawed. The Examiner's statement of "the captured image and the telephone number are stored in the same file is incorrect based on characteristics of a relationship database.

A text field, a memo field or a numeral field in a table of a relational database is realized by creating a storage area for storing the data in the table of the database itself. However, a field quantity of a large data such as an image data is realized by creating a storage area for storing a pointer in the table of the database, and the image is stored separately. The pointer will point to a storage area storing the large data or image and the image will reside outside the database. Therefore, the image and personal information will not be stored in the same file and the telephone number will not be stored in the comment segment of the JPEG file.

Additionally, even if the JPEG data is stored in the database, the JPEG data is recorded in a field different than a field for a telephone number. The JPEG data is recorded separately from the number and not in the comment segment of the JPEG file.

Therefore, Applicant submits that all of the independent claims are patentably distinct from the cited references as the references fail to teach, suggest or render obvious each and every limitation of the claims.

Furthermore, with regard to Claims 8, 16, 21, and 27, Applicant submits that neither reference, taken alone or in any combination thereof teaches, suggests or renders obvious the limitation of "wherein said display means displays the decoded still picture when a call is

incoming from said communication party". The Examiner identified Col. 14, lines 2-12 of Schwartz as a teaching of this limitation. The identified section does not, in fact, teach this feature. Specifically, Schwartz teaches that a user can generate a photo album that also contains a telephone-directory-type listing for each photo. However, this in no way teaches displaying the decoded still picture when receiving a call from the communication party. Accordingly, we believe that Claims 8, 16, 21 and 27 are further patentably distinct from the cited references.

All of the pending dependent claims are patentable at least based upon their dependency from the independent claims for at least the same reasons as stated above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 19-21, 24-27, and 30 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth Weinfeld

Registration No. 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 742-4343

SMW:ae